DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 874 LI 003 387

AUTHOR	Borgeson, Earl C.; Freeman, Peter
TITLE	Networks for the Legal Profession.
SPONS AGENCY	American Library Association, Chicago, Ill.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	37p.; (41 References); Working Group E-1
AVAILABLE FROM	In "Proceedings of the Conference on Interlibrary Communications and Information Networks," edited by Joseph Becker. American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, Ill. 60611 ($15.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Conferences; *Information Needs; *Information Networks; Information Storage; Law Libraries; *Lawyers; *Library Cooperation; *Library Networks
IDENTIFIERS	*Interlibrary Communications

ABSTRACT

There is a great temptation not to talk about information networks for the legal profession because there exists a well organized publishing industry meeting the historical and contemporary research needs in areas of statutory and case law, and even for administrative regulations. This is an information network. There also exists a strong, closely knit special library profession, managing to serve as storehouses of the information-data banks (law books) and as a bibliographic network. Nevertheless, the potential of the computer to introduce thoroughness, accuracy and speed to the manipulation of legal data and sophisticated communication devices to expedite access and thereby utilization of data hold genuine excitement for those who think and talk of networks. Legal service for the broadest possible community is still costly either in dollars or in wasted talent. Anything that can expedite the task of the lawyer, resulting in better and faster service at lower unit costs, has to be explored. (Other papers from this conference are available as LI 003360 - 003386 and LI 003388 through LI 003390) (Author/NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED057874

NETWORKS FOR THE LEGAL PROFESSION

by

Earl C. Borgeson
Librarian, Harvard Law School

and

Peter Freeman

Librarian, Law School
University of Alberta
Canada

Prepared for the Conference on Interlibrary Communication and Information Networks

Joseph Becker, Director

Arlie House, Warrenton, Virginia

September 28-October 2, 1970

LI 003 387

SUMMARY

The Law. Everyone is presumed to know the legal rights and responsibilities under which he lives, be they federal, state, county or municipal in application. In our democratic society, many of us participate in the establishment and enforcement of laws. There is a body of experts trained in the technical aspects of dealing with the law - the legal profession. What more vital segment of "information" could be the subject of "network" discussion?

The use of the law is essentially a search for factual patterns or for the rules of law that ought to be in effect in a conflict between parties - a search for authority in precedent. In addition to the complications of multiple jurisdictions, the recorded information in the form of court decisions and statutes are only a portion of the total volume and the annual increments of data called the literature of the law. What more challenging data banks to mechanize?

However, there is a great temptation not to talk about information networks for the legal profession because there exists a well orgainized publishing industry meeting the historical and contemporary research needs in areas of statutory and case law, and even for administrative regulations. This is an information network.

There also exists a strong, closely knit special library profession, managing to serve as storehouses of the information-

data banks (law books) and as a bibliographic network.

Nevertheless, the potential of the computer to introduce thoroughness, accuracy and speed to the manipulation of legal data and sophisticated communication devices to expedite access and thereby utilization of data hold genuine excitement for those who think and talk of networks. Legal service for the broadest possible community is still costly either in dollars or in wasted talent. Anything that can expedite the task of the lawyer, resulting in better and faster service at lower unit costs, has to be explored.

NETWORKS FOR THE LEGAL PROFESSION

The body of American legal literature is, in fact, a highly organized information network, and law libraries are a working model of a network of administrative and service components capable of two-way dialogue. It can be easily demonstrated that for more than a century a mass communication medium - the printed page - has, in a most systematic fashion, presented current legal data to the consumer in hard copy, and has provided access devices for historical inquiry, as well as manipulative devices for comparison and coordination of data. As a matter of fact, even these special access devices are in a hard-copy format. All of this network of books can be at the fingertips of every lawyer in the country, at considerable expense (Appendix 1). Indeed, most lawyers can own their own law books to whatever extent they choose (for the cost can, to a great extent, be passed along to clients) or they can share in the support of special libraries that will serve their research needs.

This may, indeed, be all that should be said, for the use of new and faster communication or manipulating machinery really does not alter the pattern or organization or the use of legal information. As a matter of fact, further discussion may only accomplish

the structuring of larger data bases;

increased speed of manipulation;

as well as more complicated retrieval programs and inquiry in-put;

> further separation of the user from convenient access; and possibly supplying the user with far more information than he can read, digest and use.

The lawyer is now deluged by the outpouring of the printed pages which must be read so that he will be competent to deal with daily matters. When he conducts research on a particular problem, moreover, he adds to that load. Although the existing retrieval systems have enabled the lawyer to keep the lid on the information explosion,[1] some opponents find in their use of "human indexes" a definite weakness.[2] Will he benefit by presentation of yet more reading material than he now reads? Today, he already delegates research to subordinates and depends upon abstracts and analyses and even the conclusions of others. What will he do tomorrow?

That body of information we refer to as American legal literature ought to be analyzed so that the nature of the "information"which would become the subject of a network is better understood.

In the first place, the "information" is created by the rule-making processes of government (including the legislative and adjudicative processes of executive, legislative or

---

[1]Gallagher, Marian G., "The Law Library in a New Law School", Texas Technological College Law Review 1:21-35 March 1969) p. 22-24

[2]Price, Miles O. "The Anglo-American Law", Library Trends 15:616-627 (April 1967) p. 624

In the second place, there is the "information" created by the rule interpretation efforts of people engaged in the tasks of resolving conflicts arising or predicted in all aspects of human relations. The rule-interpretation information is called secondary source material in a library. The greater bulk of this "information" is published and is intended to be used by others. As a matter of fact, the organizing, publishing and distributing (packaging, if you will) of this information has resulted in large law book publishing enterprises that are all responsible for the existing hard-copy, manually operated network of legal "information".

In the third place, there are the packaged retrieval programs that are labeled encyclopedias, digests, indexes, bibliographies and citators produced by these same publishers. Also, the loose-leaf service, now common to all law libraries has, because of its currency and ability to gather together all relevant matter on a particular subject, become an essential part of the lawyer's world. Each of these research aids provides approaches to legal information according to well established characteristics in the nature of legal information - jurisdiction, names of parties, dates, subject matter of legal principles or of fact situations and citations to publications.

The members of the legal profession (i.e. the practitioner, the researcher, the student, the judge) require special collections which they develop privately as well as with others. All use the same core of material but the academic

researcher, because he does not have the stricture of time or cost will need more extensive coverage to accomplish his comparative and in-depth research. The practitioner is looking for the immediate solution to his problem and is therefore interested in the type of material which will serve this purpose, which probably accounts for the popularity of the "current awareness" loose-leaf service. The practitioners' library will emphasize this type of material and particularly in his fields of specialty. The practitioner's library will also reflect his local jurisdiction and he is unlikely to desire materials for other than neighboring jurisdictions. The same materials will not satisfy lawyers in all parts of the country.

The judges use of legal materials will be almost similar to that of the practitioner. He will not have the pressure of immediacy, but normally will be dependent upon the research of counsel. In many courts he will have the assistance of a law clerk who may assist him with in-depth research.

The corporation lawyer will differ from the general practitioner in that he will have only one client although the client's interests may be many. His library will reflect these interests and is likely to contain materials from legally related areas as well as the core materials.

The layman should not be ignored in any discussion of access to legal materials. Presently, (if he is the unskilled layman), he probably relies upon his public library. However, if he is a skilled researcher from another discipline he may require access to the specialized collection of a law library.

Although the latter may initially appear to be the most important, the necessity for easy access to the "law of the land" by the general public cannot be ignored.

A suggested method of research[3] for the common core of material used by all lawyers suggests the following steps:

(a) analysis of the problem

(b) preliminary review of the subject matter

(c) search of statutes and administrative regulations involved

(d) search for cases in point

(e) search of encyclopedias and treatises

(f) search of legal periodicals

(g) search of loose-leaf services

(h) search of miscellaneous materials

(i) completing the search

(j) appraising the authorities found

This should give some assistance in understanding the lawyers' use of legal materials.[4] It should also be remembered that the greater bulk of the lawyers searching is retrospective unlike other professionals who are concerned primarily with current awareness.

One final excursion, to complete the picture of the present situation, should be made into the area of law libraries.

---

[3] Price, Miles O. and Bitner, Harry. Effective Legal Research (3d ed., Boston, Little, Brown 1969) p. 359

[4] For a more detailed explanation, see Cohen, Morris L. "Research Habits of Lawyers", Jurimetrics Journal 9:183-194 (June 1969)

Where are they, what are they, how do they function?

In the absence of a strong statistical data-base, a deplorable condition from which law librarianship is only now slowly making an escape,[5] several ad hoc "countings" reveal that there are about 995 law libraries with collections of 5,000 or more volumes, employing 1,414 librarians.[6]

Type of Library	Libraries	Librarians
County	353	363
Law School	162	449
Law Office	130	125
Court	113	134
Government	88	118
Company	76	87
Bar Association	37	75
State	36	64

The geographical distribution (Appendix 3) places the largest number of law libraries in New York (130), California (118), Ohio (83), Pennsylvania (72), District of Columbia (59), and Illinois (47), with the fewest number in New Hampshire (1), North and South Dakota (2 each), Rhode Island (2), Hawaii (2), and Vermont, West Virginia and Wyoming (3 each). Of course, a more meaningful analysis would be the geographical distribution of collections, for it is in

---

[5]Schick, Frank L. "The Century Gap of Law Library Statistics," Law Library Journal 61:1-6 (1968)

[6]Mersky, R. "Progress in Law Librarianship", Bowker Annual (New York: 1970) p. 278

this way that the "informational" and "bibliographical" resources can be related to potential users and, indeed, serve as a basis for structuring meaningful networks to accomplish sharing of resources and service loads.

Because the law schools generally develop libraries beyond the working collection level as a result of library standards of accrediting associations and, of course, their own competitive programs of instruction and research, their libraries will probably be the base units of a network. Furthermore, they respond to the lawyer's need for non-legal materials too. This is an additional asset if law libraries in universities also tie into general library information networks. The 1969 annual survey conducted by the American Bar Association Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar shows that 137 reporting libraries hold 14,038,969 volumes. These same libraries spent $7,851,712 for the upkeep and development of their collections (Appendix 2).

Can there be serious question as to the consumer-need and participant-potential for network thinking, planning and operation?

What then is the extent of existing law library cooperation? In his comprehensive survey of law libraries in 1953[7] Roalfe found the following types of cooperation:

(1) informal exchange of information

[7] Roalfe, William R. The Libraries of the Legal Profession (St. Paul: West, 1953). p. 356-357.

(2) exchanges of services

(3) interlibrary loans

(4) reciprocal use

(5) coordination in development of collections

Although he found some cooperation to exist, he came to the conclusion that "when the field is considered as a whole, cooperation is not as widespread as it is between some other types of libraries."[8] This he attributed to the fact that law libraries are highly specialized, that they are created to serve limited groups of users, that their basic collection must be kept intact at all times, that there is institutional jealousy, that the many law libraries are widely separated, and most important that law libraries are staffed "by persons who, however desirable their qualifications, may otherwise have no awareness of , or interest in law library service as a profession."[9]

A survey of the literature since that date finds isolated examples of cooperation[10] but other than certain regional programs, (i.e. Union list of Foreign Legal

---

[8] Ibid., 352

[9] Ibid., 354

[10] "Cooperation in Law library service - a panel", Law Library Journal, 49:413-436 (1956); "Cooperation Among Law Libraries - a panel" Law Library Journal, 52:418-434 (1959); Coonan, Margaret E., "The opportunities Law Librarians are missing", Law Library Journal 54:218-222 (1961) Moody, Myrtle, "Opportunities for Library Cooperation" Law Library Journal, 54:223-226 (1961); Snook, Helen A., "Cooperative effort in cataloguing", Law Library Journal, 53:115-117 (1960); Vambery, Joseph T., "The new scope and content of cooperative cataloguing for law libraries, Law Library Journal 60:244- (1967)

Periodicals in Southwestern Library Association, Chicago Association of Law Libraries, etc.) and those organized by the American Association of Law Libraries there are no co-ordinated national programs of significance. The American Association of Law Libraries has attempted to remove the cause of Roalfe's conclusion.

A law library network should hope eventually to give both bibliographic and information retrieval to the lawyer. Information retrieval in this context is the delivery of the complete text while bibliographic retrieval relates to citations, etc. The development of the information network would be complex because there are both vested interests to be considered, as well as the many imaginative excursions (e.g. Mead Data Central, Inc. OBAR System, Law Research Services, the University of Pittsburgh Health Law Center System, Project LITE) into computer manipulation of legal literature being made and suggestions[11] to be evaluated. That information retrieval is important is self evident. Thirty thousand estimated judicial decisions are added to the present approximate two and one-half million each year, not to mention another 10,000 legislative enactments. This area ought to be left with words of encouragement, not words of meaningless challenge or uninformed advice for change. It is timely for a coordinating agency to bring both the publishers and the computer-service

[11] Marx, Stephen M. "Citation Networks in the Law", Jurimetrics Journal 10:121-137 (June 1970).

people together into a serious planning conference, despite the cloud of a Federal Trade Commission injunction against possible monopolistic trade practices. Any network giving only bibliographic control without the future prospect of complete information retrieval would be a waste. It is unlikely that it would be universally accepted and used by practitioners until it performs both functions.

This, then, leaves the "bibliographic" network to structure. Its creation and operation might be along the following lines:

1. A central administrative office must be created with a minimum management staff capable of:

   carrying on negotiations with libraries that will operate as service units;

   designing forms to standardize inquiries or referrals;

   gathering statistics for program expansion and operation evaluation;

   publicizing the network to all potential users;

   gathering and circulating state-of-the-art data to participants; and coordinating a set of procedures with patience and strength.

This <u>will not</u> be a super library; it will have no collection or professional reference staff; initially it will not create or maintain bibliographic data (union catalog) itself. However, as the communications network becomes more developed and instantaneous, it will act as a switching agency

to the various available data bases (government, publishers, libraries, etc.) Possible existing agencies wherein this type of control center might be introduced are:

Law library of Congress

American Bar Center

Federal Judicial Center

Of course, if the proposed National Foundation for Law and Justice were created, it could indeed perform these services.

2. Since law libraries will have the same basic materials, the heirarchy established will reflect a library's additions to these holdings. Using present means of communication, the earlier request would be forwarded along the network until answered. Although it would be desirable to have a union catalog to which the local library could refer directly, it is not practical to delay a network until it is achieved. The computerized retrieval systems will bring this about. Whether this final development of the computerized switching center should be developed by merging various data bases or by simply converting one of the national resources (i.e. Law Library of Congress or Harvard) to machine readable form is a decision this administrative agency must meet. The actual network would be a group of participating libraries with one ortwo serving as regional resource units, and a resource would be designated for each state. These libraries would be selected because of the over-all strength of their collections and staff; some unique, special-subject or jurisdictional units may have to be added to the number

specified above. All participants must, by written agreement, establish membership in the network and play a role as one or more of the following:

National Resource

Regional Resource

State Resource

Local Library

The patron will set in motion a chain reaction whenever he makes an inquiry that is not satisfied locally. At present, requests in most cases go directly to Harvard or the Law Library of Congress. Many of these requests could be answered by a closer library. It is likely that a law school library will become the state resource if not a regional resource as well. As Appendix 2 indicates, many are well supported, and have substantial collections. An additional advantage would be their connection with other networks i.e. EDUNET,[12] state networks.[13]

3. The service units simply pledge to respond to reference and lending (or reproduction) requests that come to them on standard forms, from local patrons or libraries on lower levels with which they have been paired in the network. Responses will go directly to the patron, with a report form forwarded to the central control office.

---

[12]Brown, George W. and others. Edunet-Report of the Summer Study on Information Networks (New York: John Wiley, 1967) 440 p.

[13]Becker, Joseph and Hayes, Robert M. A Proposed Library Network for Washington State. Working paper for the Washington State Library (Seattle: 1967) 50p.

4. Funds to maintain the central control office, provide personnel and cover the costs of communication will have to be found. Although simply stated, this will be a governing factor. A simple transaction charge to the patron can be devised to meet most operating expenses other than personnel.

5. Expansion and sophistication can occur under the informed and imaginative guidance of the managing officer. For example:

A. Advice and money might be made available to law libraries to strengthen collections in the national interest.

B. Statistical and other information could be made available to participating libraries.

C. On the other hand, to achieve the demise or merger of weak collections, funding and negotiating skills might be made available.

D. As the machine data base expands, the various phases of technical processes in law libraries can be abandoned, with dollars directed to participation in the machine network service, or in meeting user needs more directly. The conversion of the existing "information" network into a machine scheme will be a major area for development.

Unfortunately, explaining another existing set of relationships between law libraries and calling it a plan for a "bibliographic" network really suggests little that is new. The absolutely essential element that is not functioning

in the present reference-circulation services between libraries is central management - management with responsibility, authority and money to set and enforce the form and standards of service, to evaluate performance and to move systematically to develop a total national network service, both "bibliographic" and "informational."

One would be remiss, even with such relatively unexciting proposals, not to outline a few of the problems that might arise. Again, there is no claim of uniqueness:

1. The legal profession, with relatively few exceptions, still appears to be conservative and not easily parted from the convenience (and prestige) of direct access and ownership of hard-copy law books. Concern will be expressed about confidentiality, about the system of advocacy, about deterioration of justice stripped of human influence. The lawyer will have to be convinced by the network performance, particularly its reliability.

2. The publishers of law books will not watch a market disappear; they can be strong allies if convinced that a "research and development" department in their plant could merely change the format of their product from the hard-copy, man-readable data banks to machine-readable data banks.

3. Law Libraries will not readily alter their identity to become parts of a national structure. The traditional, individual stature of the law library has many supporters.

4. The staggering investments in law libraries today create fear in those in the profession who must raise and

allocate such sums. They want something cheaper. Part of the appeal of automation is the possibility of avoiding present costs. Of course, the new costs will be greater, but being new, they may be somewhat easier to justify for a time.

5. Obviously, the availability of personnel to institute and continue either kind of network service is a problem. The educational process, at some time, will have to meet its responsibility for training people in the manipulation and use of its records.

6. Any data bank construction - for either type of network - must not be selective. Doubts about editorial judgment plague the research efforts of everyone today, because with manual schemes there must be limitations set. The open-end capacities of machines could remove doubts.

7. Significant legal problems too must be resolved - ownership of property, copyright, status of data as evidence, and so forth.

To summarize, it is highly desirable to move toward an ultimate "information" network, servicing the legal profession and the general public on a national basis.

Because the literature of the law is, indeed, a rather sophisticated manual "information" network, it seems to be the wiser course to recommend the development of a "bibliographic" network, building upon the existing facilities, services and personnel in the nation's law libraries. While these services are being expanded and the program developed, the conditioning

of librarians and patrons for the "day of-the-machine" must begin in the literature, in the schools and in the promotional effort for this service.

There are advantages, in addition to more and better informational access, to be realized. Local libraries will still collect locally-used materials, at least until all legal information is in the computer data-base format. With such collecting limitations possible, the dollar commitment of the local law library should diminish.

Reliance of local law libraries on state, regional or national units does mean that these latter libraries will have to have funds to maintain their strengths, over and above continuing to serve also as local libraries in their communities. There will also have to be established (in the national interest) collecting responsibilities for these libraries provided their administrative authorities will allow them to be so directed.

In the area of book processing, the potential of MARC and similar cataloging and then classifying techniques, utilizing machine storage for national purposes, should reduce individual library operating costs.

The development of new bibliographic services (indexes, abstracts, digests, and bibliographies) should excite library personnel and result in more effective service to library users. These products will also be retrieval programs for the automated scheme.

A morale-lifter can also be provided, for law librarians, having to rely on bibliographic services and communication devices to give better service, will take pride in being a part of a national program and in making it work to its fullest potential.

The training of personnel for network duties will emphasize the use of libraries more than legal research techniques. The bibliographic skills of the librarian will have to be learned well.

The development of a law library network through its connection with other information networks will allow even greater flow of information between the lawyer and those of other disciplines. Much previously inaccessible information to both will now be available.

It cannot be denied that public support will be necessary to develop this network. The support made available for the various medical information programs could serve as a guide. Although it may be argued that the social necessity is not as great, it is clear that only through the development of such a network and retrieval system that the private practitioner will be on an equal footing with his colleague, representing government or the large corporation who will have this type of assistance. It is also hoped that such a network would improve the quality of legal service by increasing the information available to him to the benefit of both the individual client and the general public.

APPENDIX B

A BASIC WORKING LAW COLLECTION FOR THE U.S. LAWYER[1]

(March 1969)

Type of Book	Approximate Initial Cost	Approximate Annual Cost of Upkeep, Supplementation
Current statutes of 51 U.S. jurisdictions.	$15,796.50	$2,807.50
If money and/or space is not available for all the codes, it is suggested that a selection of codes for States adjacent to the local State be made in addition to the California and New York Codes.		
United States Code Annotated.	613.50	163.00
Code of Federal Regulations.	213.00	125.00
National Reporter System, Including *Federal Cases.*	30,929.50	1,392.50
American Digest System;		
Decennials 4th through 7th	1,860.00	
The 4th-7th cover 1926-66; the earlier units can be purchased on the second-hand book market for approximately $75 for Decennial.		
General Digest, Fourth Series.	210.00	160.00
A current legal encyclopedia:		
American Jurisprudence, 2d. v.1-43	903.00*	176.00
or		
Corpus Juris Secundum.	1,197.00	140.00
Black's Law Dictionary.	12.50	
Form Books:		
American Jurisprudence Forms.	285.00*	19.50
or		
Modern Legal Forms.	140.00	24.00
American Law Reports:		
1st Series.	1,750.00	
2nd Series.	1,250.00	
3rd Series, v.1-23.	665.00	120.00
Index & Digests.	535.00	35.00
Shepard's Citations:		
State citators for all States.	4,018.00	1,891.00
National Reporter citators.	980.00	404.00
Uniform Laws Annotated.	135.00	50.00
A.L.I. Restatements of the Law, complete.	356.00	
Treatises:		
The impossibility of treatise coverage for every legal subject and the expense of purchasing all material published are the main justifications for the legal encyclopedia. There are 15 legal headings in the list of treatises prepared by a committee of the Association of American Law Schools as a recommended purchase list for law libraries. Here, by way of sample, is listed a standard treatise in each of 14 topics.		

---

[1] Jurkins, Jacquelyn. "Development of the County Law Library", Law Library Journal, 62: 140-152 (1969)

Type of Book	Approximate Initial Cost	Approximate Annual Cost of Upkeep, Supplementation
Appleman on Insurance	$387.50	$ 60.00
Blashfield on Automobile Law, 3rd.	360.00	6.50
Collier on Bankruptcy.	450.00	163.50
Davis on Administrative Law.	80.00	9.00
Fletcher on Private Corporations.	345.00	102.50
Hursh on American Law of Products Liability.	70.00	17.50
McQuillan on Municipal Corporations.	300.00	95.00
Nichols on Eminent Domain.	280.00	60.00
Page on Wills.	210.00	33.00
Prosser on Torts.	12.50	
Rabkin & Johnson, Federal Income, Gift & Estate Taxation.	7[illegible].00	100.00
Wharton Criminal Law & Procedure.	9[illegible].50	15.00
Wigmore on Evidence.	175.00	30.00
Williston on Contracts.	240.00	60.00
Index to Legal Periodicals.		
More than 275 legal periodicals, as well as journals of law associations and journals of judicial councils, are indexed. Although a library may not have the periodicals, this *Index* gives the user access to the articles indexed and, in most areas, the articles can be borrowed on an interlibrary loan.		
August 1952 through August 1967.	177.00	25.00 (service basis)
Totals:	$63,801.50••	$8,120.50••
	$63,950.50•••	$8,089.00•••

• Alternative publications listed.
•• Totals include •Alternative publications.
••• Totals include non-• Alternative publications.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
SECTION OF LEGAL EDUCATION AND ADMISSION TO THE BAR

ANNUAL SURVEY - FALL 1969

STATE & UNIVERSITY	NUMBER OF BOOKS	BOOK BUDGET 1969-70
ALABAMA		
Samford	50,351	$ 40,000
Alabama	91,000	115,000
ARIZONA		
Arizona State	80,000	73,000
Univ. of Arizona	79,039	78,500
ARKANSAS		
Univ. of Arkansas (Fayetteville)	83,000	60,000
Univ. of Arkansas (Little Rock)	no report	no report
CALIFORNIA		
Berkeley	241,342	108,000
Davis	75,729	169,608
Los Angeles	198,344	97,000
Loyola (L.A.)	115,073	60,600
Southern California	111,000	40,000
Univ. of Pacific	32,982	42,500
California Western	36,280	no report
University of San Diego	43,000	43,876
Hastings	64,069	110,000
Golden Gate	no report	no report
San Francisco	45,311	77,500
Santa Clara	57,773	39,000
Stanford	179,089	96,360

STATE & UNIVERSITY	NUMBER OF BOOKS	BUDGET 1969-70
COLORADO		
Univ. of Colorado	99,144	$ 60,000
Univ. of Denver	65,000	42,000
CONNECTICUT		
Univ. of Connecticut	71,000	73,500
Yale	no report	no report
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
American University	67,500	38,000
Catholic University	51,282	45,000
Georgetown	145,000	50,000
George Washington	102,320	60,000
Howard	120,000	85,281
FLORIDA		
University of Miami	140,000	75,000
University of Florida	102,768	57,000
Stetson	59,298	40,000
Florida State	38,976	55,000
GEORGIA		
Georgia	161,118	106,872
Emory	68,700	52,000
Mercer	43,012	38,540
IDAHO		
Idaho	49,550	40,000

STATE & UNIVERSITY	NUMBER OF BOOKS	BUDGET 1969-70
ILLINOIS		
Illinois	205,903	99,900
Chicago-Kent	41,001	25,000
De Paul	57,591	42,000
John Marshall	40,481	7,000
Loyola (Chicago)	56,139	30,000
Northwestern	270,659	89,500
Chicago	265,260	no report
INDIANA		
University of Indiana (Bloomington)	124,079	72,000
University of Indiana (Indianapolis)	88,804	41,056
Notre Dame	12,000	55,000
Valparaiso	44,200	38,650
IOWA		
Drake	no report	no report
Iowa	168,351	84,000
KANSAS		
Kansas	102,000	37,010
Washburn	36,000	23,000
KENTUCKY		
University of Kentucky	99,809	60,000
University of Louisville	56,000	18,200

STATE & UNIVERSITY	NUMBER OF BOOKS	BUDGET 1969-70
LOUISIANA		
Louisiana State	158,097	$ 47,454
Southern	38,884	17,002
Loyola (N.O.)	36,000	60,000
Tulane	131,000	44,800
MAINE		
Maine	80,009	42,000
MARYLAND		
Maryland	66,901	99,250
MASSACHUSETTS		
Boston University	95,730	91,100
New England	no report	no report
Northeastern	51,189	135,000
Suffolk	47,600	77,000
Boston College	85,013	60,000
Harvard	1,149,353	140,000
MICHIGAN		
Michigan	400,000	160,000
Detroit College	30,139	25,000
University of Detroit	no report	no report
Wayne State	102,748	69,740
MINNESOTA		
Minnesota	320,523	104,500
William Mitchell	33,400	38,000

STATE & UNIVERSITY	NUMBER OF BOOKS	BUDGET 1969-70
MISSISSIPPI		
Mississippi	48,632	$ 37,500
MISSOURI		
Missouri	120,590	55,918
Missouri (Kansas City)	47,442	63,937
St. Louis University	96,844	32,838
Washington University	116,950	41,477
MONTANA		
Montana	63,353	18,000
NEBRASKA		
Nebraska	74,813	51,076
Creighton	52,219	21,000
NEW JERSEY		
Rutgers, Camden	75,150	72,000
Rutgers, Newark	143,315	101,000
Seton Hall	67,200	25,000
NEW MEXICO		
New Mexico	81,745	50,650
NEW YORK		
Union	80,000	18,200
State University, Buffalo	119,000	93,000
Cornell	234,366	133,200
Brooklyn	69,754	35,000
Columbia	501,000	104,500

STATE & UNIVERSITY	NUMBER OF BOOKS	BUDGET 1969-70
NEW YORK (continued)		
Fordham	117,280	41,700
New York Law School	50,200	29,200
New York University	324,715	108,000
St. Johns	82,279	51,947
Syracuse	56,000	40,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
North Carolina	127,659	70,239
Duke	163,087	77,500
North Carolina Central	32,413	6,700
Wake Forest	40,156	15,500
NORTH DAKOTA		
North Dakota	59,202	34,800
OHIO		
Ohio Northern	48,000	37,100
Akron	39,664	77,000
Cincinnati	61,239	75,000
Chase College of Law	31,662	50,000
Cleveland	67,300	63,000
Case Western Reserve	119,663	70,000
Capitol	33,900	33,400
Ohio State	270,023	110,000
Toledo	61,357	43,500
OKLAHOMA		
Oklahoma	70,000	55,000

STATE & UNIVERSITY	NUMBER OF BOOKS	BUDGET 1969-70
OKLAHOMA (continued)		
Oklahoma City	25,668	$ 15,800
University of Tulsa	47,307	38,000
OREGON		
Oregon	no report	no report
Willamette	37,186	38,800
PENNSYLVANIA		
Dickinson	60,300	41,000
Temple	no report	no report
Pennsylvania	212,587	92,750
Duquesne	46,230	27,000
University of Pittsburgh	73,230	40,000
Villanova	141,469	50,000
PUERTO RICO		
Interamerican	22,000	12,000
Catholic University	37,044	35,000
Puerto Rico	71,035	62,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
South Carolina	61,364	24,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
South Dakota	56,000	21,500
TENNESSEE		
Tennessee	81,439	50,000

STATE & UNIVERSITY	NUMBER OF BOOKS	BUDGET 1969-70
TENNESSEE (continued)		
Memphis State	62,000	$102,000
Vanderbilt	93,705	45,000
TEXAS		
Texas	211,181	95,854
Southern Methodist	154,729	78,000
Houston	80,000	66,000
South Texas College	41,018	37,000
Texas Southern	29,488	29,000
Texas Tech	40,941	82,500
St. Mary's	40,077	42,295
Baylor	65,540	17,990
UTAH		
Utah	102,500	67,000
VIRGINIA		
Virginia	200,704	110,000
Washington & Lee	41,000	31,850
Richmond	41,912	13,000
College of William and Mary	47,536	58,500
WASHINGTON		
Washington	191,605	92,817
Gonzaga	42,000	27,225
WEST VIRGINIA		
West Virginia	80,141	47,000

STATE & UNIVERSITY	NUMBER OF BOOKS	BUDGET 1969-70
WISCONSIN		
Wisconsin	124,646	$ 42,000
Marquette	61,463	37,650
WYOMING		
Wyoming	40,639	36,000

Note: for full statistics see Lewis, Alfred J., " 1969 Statistical Survey of Law School Libraries and Librarians" Law Library Journal, 63:267-272 (May 1970)

APPENDIX I

DISTRIBUTION OF LAW LIBRARIES AND LAW LIBRARIANS [1]

State	Libraries (A)	Librarians (B)	Bar or Assoc. A/B	Company A/B	County A/B	Court A/B	Gov't A/B	Law Office A/B	Law School A/B	State A/B
Alabama	9	14	-	-	5/5	1/3	-	1/1	2/5	-
Alaska	5	4	-	-	-	5/4	-	-	-	-
Arizona	15	16	-	-	12/13	-	-	-	2/2	1/1
Arkansas	6	5	1/-	1/1	1/1	1/1	-	-	2/2	-
California	118	195	-	5/5	58/78	6/7	11/13	19/23	18/68	1/1
Colorado	12	15	-	1/1	-	5/4	1/1	3/3	2/6	-
Connecticut	12	24	3/4*	2/2	4/5*	-	-	-	2/11	1/2
Delaware	4	4	-	2/2	1/1	-	-	-	-	1/1
Dist. Columbia	59	104	3/5	6/5	-	7/9	33/63	5/5	5/17	-
Florida	28	42	-	-	17/21	2/3	1/1	3/3	5/14	-
Georgia	11	15	-	1/-	4/4*	1/1	-	-	4/9	1/1
Hawaii	2	2	-	-	-	1/1	1/1	-	-	-
Idaho	4	4	-	-	2/2	-	-	-	1/1	1/1
Illinois	47	84	3/9	8/7	5/15	4/6	6/6	13/12	8/29	-
Indiana	15	17	1/1	1/1	5/5	3/2	-	1/1	4/7	-
Iowa	6	7	2/2*	-	1/1*	-	-	-	2/3	1/1
Kansas	6	8	-	1/1	2/2	-	-	-	2/3	1/2

* Bar Association and County Libraries may be combined.

American Association of Law Libraries. Recruitment Checklist 1969. (Chicago). p.36-38.

State	Libraries (A)	Librarians (B)	Bar or Assoc. A/B	Company A/B	County A/B	Court A/B	Gov't A/B	Law Office A/B	Law School A/B	State A/B
Kentucky	6	6	-	-	2/1	-	1/-	-	2/4	1/1
Louisiana	8	16	-	-	-	2/4	1/1	1/1	4/10	-
Maine	20	20	3/3*	-	15/14*	-	-	-	1/1	1/2
Maryland	14	15	3/3*	1/1	2/2	3/2	2/3	-	2/3	1/1
Massachusetts	36	66	7/10*	2/2	11/14*	1/2	1/1	5/5	8/27	1/5
Michigan	25	36	3/6*	4/4	11/10*	-	-	2/2	4/12	1/2
Minnesota	16	27	1/1*	3/3	3/5*	1/1	-	5/2	2/10	1/5
Mississippi	4	7	-	-	1/1	-	-	1/1	1/4	1/1
Missouri	17	19	3/3*	1/1	2/2*	6/3	-	2/1	4/9	-
Montana	5	5	-	1/1	2/2	-	-	-	1/1	1/1
Nebraska	4	5	-	-	1/1	-	-	-	2/3	1/1
Nevada	6	6	-	-	4/4	-	-	-	1/1	1/1
New Hampshire	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/1
New Jersey	20	25	2/3*	4/5	8/6*	-	1/1	1/1	3/6	1/3
New Mexico	5	13	-	-	2/2	1/2	-	-	1/7	1/2
New York	130	205	10/20*	16/23	9/17*	32/41	7/7	43/44	12/49	1/4
N. Carolina	9	16	-	-	1/1	2/2	-	1/1	5/12	-
N. Dakota	2	2	-	-	-	1/1	-	-	1/1	-
Ohio	83	97	10/17*	2/2	50/51*	2/2	4/5	7/7	8/13	-

* Bar Association and County Libraries may be combined.

State	Libraries (A)	Librarians (B)	Bar or Assoc. A/B	Company A/B	County A/B	Court A/B	Gov't A/B	Law Office A/B	Law School A/B	State A/B
Oklahoma	11	13	1/1	4/4	2/2	-	-	-	3/5	1/1
Oregon	13	16	-	-	7/7	1/2	1/1	1/1	3/5	-
Pennsylvania	72	88	2/4*	4/3	41/41*	2/1	3/3	13/13	6/20	1/3
Puerto Rico	8	11	-	-	-	1/2	2/2	-	5/7	-
Rhode Island	2	6	-	-	-	-	1/2	-	-	1/4
S. Carolina	5	6	-	-	-	2/3	-	-	2/2	1/1
S. Dakota	2	3	-	-	-	1/1	-	-	1/2	-
Tennessee	12	17	2/2*	-	3/3*	2/2	1/1	-	3/7	1/2
Texas	29	37	-	3/3	6/6	6/6	3/3	3/1	8/18	-
Utah	4	6	-	-	2/1	-	-	-	1/4	1/1
Vermont	3	3	-	1/1	-	1/1	-	-	-	1/1
Virginia	10	14	2/1	2/2	-	1/1	-	-	4/9	1/1
Washington	19	30	-	-	11/10	2/4	1/1	3/3	2/12	-
W. Virginia	3	7	-	-	1/1	-	-	-	1/2	1/4
Wisconsin	12	22	-	1/1	5/6	2/2	-	1/1	2/9	1/3
Wyoming	3	3	-	-	1/1	-	-	-	1/1	1/1
TOTALS	978	1,429	62/95	77/81	320/364	108/126	82/116	134/132	163/463	33/62

* Bar Association and County Libraries may be combined.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Layman, and Caldwell, Marye, ed. Communication Science and Law. Indianapolis: Bobbs-merrill, 1965. 442p.

American Council of Learned Societies. Statement: Recommendations of the Committee on Research Libraries, submitted to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. November 1967.

Becker, Joseph. "Information Network Prospects in the United States," Library Trends 17:306-317 (1969)

___, and Olsen, Wallace C. "Information Networks," in Carlos A. Cuadra, ed., Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, Vol. 3 p. 289-327. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1968.

Broadman, Estelle. "The Professional User: The Library and Informational Service Needs of Practioner." in Douglas M. Knight and Shepley Nourse, ed., Libraries at Large, p. 152-157. New York: Bowker, 1969.

Brown, George W. and others. Edunet: Report of the Summer Study on Information Networks. New York: John Wiley, 1967. 440p.

Carnovsky, Leon. "Library Networks: Promise and Performance, "The Library Quarterly 39:1-108 (1969).

Cohen, Morris In U. S. Congress. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Hearings before the Sub-Committee on Education. 90th Congress 2d Session (Washington, D. C. : Govt Print. Off., 1968). Part 4, p. 1295-1306.

___, "Research Habits of Lawyers, "Jurimetrics 9:183-194 (1969).

Coonan, Margaret E. "The Opportunities Law Librarians are Missing," Law Library Journal 54: 218-222 (1961).

"Cooperation Among Law Libraries:" a panel. Law Library Journal 52:418-434 (1959).

"Cooperation in Law Library Service:" a panel. Law Library Journal 49:413-436 (1956).

Dougherty, Richard M. "Library Technology;" a panel discussion. Law Library Journal 61: 413-418 (1968).

Duggan, Maryann. "Library Network Analysis and Planning," Journal of Library Automation 2:157-175 (1969).

Feordalisi, Vincent and others. "Project Lawsearch:" AALL Special Committee on Project Lawsearch, Law Library Journal 60:42-63 (1967).

Gallagher, Marian G. in College, University and Special Libraries of the Pacific Northwest, Vol. 3, p. 131-141. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1961.

Goderich, Mario. "Cooperative Acquisitions: The Experience of General Libraries and Prospects for Law Libraries," Law Library Journal 63:57-61 1970.

Havlik, Robert J. "Law Libraries at the State level, "Law Library Journal 60:64-68 (1967).

Hamilton Clark L. "The Computer and the Legal Profession," Law and Computer Technology Part I 3:58-65; Part II 3: 97-107 (1970).

Jurkins, Jacquelyn. "Development of the County Law Library," Law Library Journal 62:140-152 (1969).

Knox, William T. "National Information Networks and Special Libraries," Special Libraries 57:627-630 (1966).

Lawlor, Reed C. "Computers, Law, and Society: Where Do We Go From Here?" Jurimetrics 8:54-58 (1966).

Lewis, Alfred J. "1969 Statistical Survey of Law School Libraries and Librarians," Law Library Journal 63:267-272 (1970).

"The Library of Congress as the National Library: Potentialities for Service," in Douglas M. Knight and Shepley Nourse, ed., Libraries at Large, p. 435-465. New York: Bowker, 1969.

"Library Systems for the 1970's," News Notes of California Libraries (Supp.) 65:283-436 (1970).

Licklider, J. C. R. Libraries of the Future. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965. 219p.

Marx, Stephen M. "Citation Networks In Law," Jurimetrics Journal 10: 121-137 (1970).

Merskey, R. "Progress in Law Librarianship," Bowker Annual 278-279. New York, 1970.

Moody, Myrtle A. "Opportunities for Library Cooperation," Law Library Journal 54:223-226 (1961).

Murphy, W. D.; Horty, J. F.; and Budengton, W. S. "Libraries of the Future," a panel discussion, Law Library Journal 60:379-397 (1967).

Nelson Associates. Public Library Systems in the United States: a survey of multi-jurisdictional systems for the Public Library Association. Chicago: American Library Association, 1969. 368p.

Overhage, Carl F. J. "Information Networks," in Carlos A. Cuadra, ed., Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, Vol. 4, p. 339-377. Chicago: Encyclopedia, 1969.

___, and others. "The National Network of Information Centers," in the Intrex Report of a Planning Conference on Information Transfer Experiments. Chap. 3:15-23. Cambridge, MIT Press, 1965.

Poole, H. Albert. "AALL Classification Survey 1968," Law Library Journal 61:255-258 (1968).

"Possibilities of Innovations in Research Methods for Law," a panel, Law Library Journal 53:346-368 (1960).

Price, Miles O., and Bitner, Harry, Effective Legal Research. 3d ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1969. 503p.

"Report of Ad Hoc Joint Committee on National Library Information Systems (CONLIS)," American Library Association Bulletin 62:255-265 (1968).

Roalfe, William R. The Libraries of the Legal Profession. St. Paul: West, 1953. 471p.

Schick, Frank L. "The Century Gap of Law Library Statistics," Law Library Journal 61:1-6 (1968).

Shank, Russell. "Networks," Bowker Annual 291-296. New York, 1970.

Snook, Helen A. "Cooperative Effort in Cataloging," Law Library Journal 53:115-117 (1960).

Tapper, Colin. "World Co-operation in the Mechanization of Legal Information Retrieval," Jurimetrics 9:1-11 (1968).

Troy, Frank J., "Ohio Bar Automated Research-A Practical System of Computerized Legal Research" Jurimetrics Journal p. 62-69 (1969)

Vambery, Joseph T. "The New Scope and Content of Cooperative Cataloguing for Law Libraries," Law Library Journal 60:244-248 (1967).